



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,261	12/18/2003	Osman Polat	9475	1913

27752 7590 07/12/2005

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/740,261

Applicant(s)

POLAT ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/9/04 & 12/18/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/17/05, 8/5/04 AND 2/6/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) On page 8, line 4, it appears that “an/or” is suppose to read “and/or.”
 - b) On page 15, line 15, it appears that “iimpressing” is suppose to read “impressing.”
 - c) The specification should be amended to refer to the present application as a CIP of 10/360,038 and as a CIP of 10/360,021.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2-3 are objected to because of the following informality: The claims fails to specify whether the ratio is referring to a cellulosic to synthetic ratio or a synthetic to cellulosic ratio. The specification refers to a synthetic to cellulosic ratio on page 7, lines 20-24, therefore, it appears that the applicant intended to claim a synthetic to cellulosic ratio. Appropriate correction is requested.
3. Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form. The specification defines the “short cellulosic fibers” of claim 1 as fibers having a length in the longest dimension of less than about 2 mm (see page 5, lines 4-6). Therefore, the short fibers inherently have a length weighted average fiber length of less than about 2 mm.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan et al. (hereinafter referred to as Trokhan).

Regarding claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20, Trokhan discloses a fibrous structure comprising at least two layers wherein at least one of the layers of the structure includes long (greater than about 2 mm) cellulosic fibers and at least one of the layers includes short (less than about 2 mm) cellulosic fibers (see entire document including column 6, lines 19-68, column 12, lines 31-65, and column 13, lines 25-67). Trokhan discloses that synthetic fibers may be utilized in combination with the cellulosic fibers (column 6, lines 48-52).

Regarding claim 5, Trokhan discloses that the short cellulosic fibers are hardwood fibers (column 6, lines 19-68, column 12, lines 31-65, and column 13, lines 25-67).

Regarding claim 6, Trokhan discloses that the long cellulosic fibers are softwood fibers (column 6, lines 19-68, column 12, lines 31-65, and column 13, lines 25-67).

Art Unit: 1771

Regarding claim 16, Trokhan discloses that the product may be patterned (column 12, lines 31-65 and column 15, line 60 through column 16, line 12).

Regarding claim 17, Trokhan discloses that the long cellulosic fibers are generally randomly distributed in at least one layer of the fibrous structure (Figures 1-3).

Regarding claim 18, Trokhan discloses that the fibrous structure may be creped, uncreped or embossed (column 6, lines 32-37 and column 9, lines 48-58).

Regarding claim 19, Trokhan discloses that the fibrous structure may be combined with a separate structure to form a multi-ply article (column 6, lines 32-37 and column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 33).

Regarding claim 20, Trokhan discloses that a latex may be disposed on at least a portion of the unitary structure (column 10, lines 5-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 2-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 above, and further in view of USPN 5,516,580 to Frenette et al. (hereinafter referred to as Frenette).

Regarding claims 2-3, Trokhan is silent with regards to a specific fiber length ratio between the synthetic fibers and the short fibers, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional ratios. Frenette provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the cellulosic and synthetic fiber mixture art to use cellulosic fibers that are shorter than the synthetic fibers. Frenette mentions a synthetic fiber to short fiber ratio of 1 to 25 (see entire document including column 2, lines 3-28 and column 3, lines 4-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 1771

time the invention was made to make the mixture with a synthetic fiber to short fiber ratio of 1 to 25, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

Regarding claim 8, Trokhan discloses that the short cellulosic fibers may have a length weighted average fiber length of less than about 1 mm (column 13, lines 25-42), but Trokhan does not mention an average cellulosic fiber width. Trokhan is silent with regards to an average cellulosic fiber width, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional cellulosic fiber widths. Frenette provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the cellulosic and synthetic fiber mixture art to use cellulosic fibers with a width of less than about 18 micrometers (column 3, lines 4-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a width of less than 18 micrometers, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

8. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 above, and further in view of WO 93/14267 to Manning.

Regarding claim 4, Trokhan is silent with regards to a PTP factor (diameter ratio) between the synthetic fibers and the short fibers, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional PTP factors. Manning provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the cellulosic and synthetic fiber mixture art to use synthetic and cellulosic fibers with a PTP factor of greater than about 0.75. Manning mentions synthetic fibers with a diameter of about 0.5 to 15 denier and cellulosic fibers with a diameter of about 4 denier (see entire document including page 7, lines 8-24 and page 8, lines 1-

Art Unit: 1771

15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a PTP factor of greater than 0.75, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

Regarding claim 9, Trokhan does not mention length weighted average fiber length of the synthetic fibers or an average synthetic fiber diameter. Trokhan is silent with regards to the synthetic fiber diameter and length, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional synthetic fiber diameters and lengths. Manning provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the cellulosic and synthetic fiber mixture art to use synthetic fibers with a length weighted average fiber length of more than about 2 mm and a diameter of more than about 15 micrometers (page 7, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use synthetic fibers with a length weighted average fiber length of more than about 2 mm and a diameter of more than about 15 micrometers, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 above, and further in view of USPN 4,202,959 to Henbest et al. (hereinafter referred to as Henbest).

Trokhan discloses that the long cellulosic fibers may have a length weighted average fiber length of greater than about 2 mm (column 13, lines 25-42), but Trokhan does not mention the average cellulosic fiber width. Trokhan is silent with regards to specific cellulosic fiber widths, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional widths. Henbest provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in

Art Unit: 1771

the art to use cellulosic fibers with an average fiber width of less than 50 micrometers (see entire document including the Examples). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the long cellulosic fibers with an average fiber width of less than 50 micrometers motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

10. Claims 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 above, and further in view of any one of USPN 5,516,580 to Frenette or WO 93/14267 to Manning.

Regarding claim 10, Trokhan discloses that the long cellulosic fibers may have a length weighted average fiber length of greater than about 2 mm (column 13, lines 25-42), but Trokhan does not mention the average cellulosic fiber width. Trokhan is silent with regards to specific cellulosic fiber widths, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional widths. Frenette and Manning each provide this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the art to use cellulosic fibers with an average fiber width of less than 50 micrometers (see column 3, lines 4-24 of Frenette and page 7, lines 8-15 of Manning). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the long cellulosic fibers with an average fiber width of less than 50 micrometers motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

Regarding claims 11-12, Trokhan discloses that synthetic fibers may be utilized in combination with the cellulosic fibers, but Trokhan does not specifically mention bicomponent synthetic fibers. Frenette and Manning each disclose that it is known in the cellulosic and synthetic fiber mixture art to use bicomponent synthetic fibers to improve adhesion between

Art Unit: 1771

fibers (column 2, lines 3-28 and column 3, lines 4-42 of Frenette and page 6, lines 11-25 of Manning). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the synthetic fibers in any suitable known fiber configuration, such as a bicomponent fiber configuration, because bicomponent fibers improve adhesion between the fibers and because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability.

Regarding claim 12, Frenette and Manning each disclose that the bicomponent fibers may be polyester and/or polyolefin based (column 3, lines 4-24 of Frenette and page 7, lines 6-15 of Manning).

Regarding claim 15, Frenette and Manning each disclose that the bicomponent fibers are heat fused to adhere the fibers (column 2, lines 19-28 of Frenette and page 8, line 17 to page 9, line 9 of Manning).

11. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,538,595 to Trokhan as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 16-20 above, and further in view of any one of USPN 5,405,499 to Vinson or USPN 5,409,572 to Kershaw et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kershaw).

Trokhan is silent with regards to specific coarseness values, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional coarseness values. Vinson and Kershaw each provide this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the art to use a low coarseness, such as less than about 25mg/100m, because the softness of the product relates to the coarseness and a softer product is desired (see entire documents including column 1, lines 24-60 of Vinson and column 3, line 65 through column 4, line 31 of Kershaw). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 1771

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the mixture of short cellulosic fibers and synthetic fibers with a coarseness value of less than about 25mg/100m motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Trokhan.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

atp


ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER